

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>		<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
		10/017,689	KAKIVAYA ET AL.
		<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
		DEBBIE M. LE	2168

**All Participants:**

(1) DEBBIE M. LE.

(2) Michael Swope.

**Date of Interview:** 22 October 2008

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*current rejection of record*

**Claims discussed:**

*1,3,8,8,9,13*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/DEBBIE M LE/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2168

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claim 8 raises an potential 35 USC 101 directed to non-statutory subject matter because the claim recites a "system", but it fails to claim a hardware component. Claims 1, 8 and 21 have also been amended. Thus, Applicant agreed with the Examiner's suggestion as directly results in the Examiner's Amendment.